

## Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended. No claims have been added. Claims 3, 13 and 23 were previously canceled. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-30 are pending.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-30 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,236,395 issued to Sezan, et al. (*Sezan*) in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0030667 of Kelts (*Kelts*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that *Sezan* and *Kelts* do not render claims 1-30 obvious.

Claim 1 recites:

- searching the multiple media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria;
- parsing the metadata;
- receiving user preference information from a content service provider;
- integrating content and metadata corresponding to the search criteria according to the user preference information and based on the result of the parsing;
- sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider; and
- rendering the integrated content concurrently on one or more user displays.

Thus, Applicants claim searching multiple media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria. The results of the search (content and metadata) are integrated according to user preference information. Claims 11 and 21 similarly recite integrating search results according to user preference information.

Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Sezan* does not disclose at least receiving preferences from a content service provider and sending integrated content and metadata to the content service provider. The Office Action further states, “*Kelts* teaches that it is known to receive preference from a content service provider and sending the integrated content and metadata to the content service provider.” See page 3. Whether or not *Kelts* discloses receiving preferences from a content service provider, *Kelts* does not teach or suggest integrating search results from multiple media sources.

*Kelts* does disclose integrating menus from multiple electronic devices. See paragraph [0103]. Because neither *Sezan* nor *Kelts* teaches or suggests integrating search results from multiple media sources, no combination of *Sezan* and *Kelts* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 11 and 21.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 12-20 depend from claim 11. Claims 22-30 depend from claim 21. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-30 are not rendered obvious by *Sezan* and *Kelts* for at least the reasons set forth above.

#### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present

Application No. 09/870,867  
Amendment dated June 16, 2004  
Response to Office Action of July 28, 2003


Atty. Docket No. 10559/476001/P11155  
Examiner Rones, Charles  
TC/A.U. 2175

application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit

Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: JUNE 16, 2004

  
Paul A. Mendonsa  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with  
the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient  
postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents,  
P.O. Box 1400, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

16 June 2004  
Date of Deposit

Deborah L. Higham  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

  
Signature

6-16-04  
Date